DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 406 HE 012 419

AUTHOR Ladd, Everett Carll, Jr.
TITLE The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association for Higher Education (Washington, DC, April 16-19, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Interest Research; Job Satisfaction; National Surveys; Research; Role Perception; Scholarly Journals; *Scholarship; Stereotypes; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching (Occupation); *Vocational Adjustment; Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Publishing

ABSTRACT

Survey data on professional activities, concerns, and commitments of the professoriat show that as a group faculty spend only a modest amount of time on scholarship and much more on teaching, by preference. This is especially true of older faculty and those in two-year colleges. In general this appears to fit with faculty responsibilities. Their dissatisfactions with the profession are not only economic but also have to do with lowering of academic standards. Despite this, the faculty "model" remains one of research and scholarship, positing what faculty should be doing, which is seriously out of touch with what they actually do and want to do. It is not necessarily true that good teaching requires involvement in scholarly research. It is concluded that it is difficult to serve both purposes well. The reward structures for research are sturdy; those for good teaching need to be rebuilt. Tables are included on publication history of American academics (total, by type of school, and by age), hours spent per week on professional activities, academic levels of students taught, relative claims of teaching and research, teaching and research commitments, professional self-perceptions, and criticisms directed at higher education. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184406

HE

The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr.
Professor of Political Science and
Director of the Social Science Data Center
Co-Executive Director of the Roper Center

Prepared for delivery at the
1979 Annual Conference of The
American Association for Higher
Education

Washington, D.C.
April 16--19, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Everett Carll Ladd, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 019 419

This paper has two parts--not unrelated but still distinct. In the first I draw upon survey data with which I have been working over the past decade to provide some straightforward, factual description of the professional activities, commitments, and concerns of academics. In the second, I try to account for that facet of the work experience of faculty that I find the most disturbing and the most threatening to the health of higher education--the ascendancy of a norm or standard of appropriate professional conduct that emphasizes the importance of "research." My argument here draws upon data presented in the first section, but as will be apparent it involves a number of bold leaps beyond the bounds of the formal survey information. Put another way, I advance in the second of this paper some hypotheses bearing upon an important dimension of the professional life of faculty that are informed by the available survey data but that cannot be confirmed (or rejected) on the basis of these data.

I. THE WORKLIFE OF AMERICAN PROFESSORS

I am hardly the first to take issue with the popular assumption that academics are a body of scholars--men and women who do their research and then report their findings

to the intellectual or scientific communities. Some faculty, of course, behave in just this fashion. But as a description of the profession, it is seriously flawed. Most academics think of themselves as "teachers" and "professionals," not as "scholars," "scientists," or "intellectuals"--and they perform accordingly.

Scholarship

As data on the number of articles in professional journals and the number of academic books published yearly testify, faculty are producing a prodigious volume of printed words. But this torrent is gushing forth from relatively few pens. Nearly three-fifths of all those employed full-time in professorial positions have never brought to publication any sort of book, written or edited singularly or in colloboration with others.[1]

---

1 In discussing the publications and other professional activities of academics, I will for reasons of stylistic comfort employ the present or the present perfect tense and write as though the data on which I am relying were collected in the Spring of 1979. In fact, the survey that I will regularly be citing was conducted in the Spring of 1977, under my direction and that of Seymour Martin Lipset. Unless otherwise specifically indicated, all of the data come from the 1977 Ladd-Lipset study. It is, though, just too awkward to write that "in the spring of 1977, ____ percent of the faculty stated that in the two years preceding the survey they had not published. . . ." There is no reason to believe that in publications or other similar facets of the work experience the faculty has changed very much over the last two years. Still I again remind the reader that I use the present tense for stylistic ease, and the data are in fact two years old. (Footnote continued on next page)

In all, just under one-fourth of American professors have published extensively--which for the sake of statistical representation, I have construed as twenty or more articles and/or three or more monographs. Over half have published nothing or very little. Young academics have, of course, not had the opportunity to accumulate as many career publications as their more senior colleagues, but the rate of current publications is somewhat higher for academics in their first two professorial decades (25 years of age to 44) than it is thereafter (Tables 3 and 5). To no one's surprise, the various surveys show massive variations in the simple rates of publication by type of institution. Thus, 87 percent of the faculty (according to the 1977 Ladd-Lipset Survey) at two-year colleges have published nothing or very little in their careers, as compared to

---

1 (cont'd.)
On occasion, I will cite information from the faculty survey conducted in 1975 under the auspices of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. I have also drawn on the 1975 Ladd-Lipset Faculty Survey and on the survey administered in 1969 for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. On the whole, these four studies present a notably consistent picture of the work experience of American academics.

- 1969. Carnegie Commission survey of faculty. 60,028 respondents from a national sample of colleges and universities. Available without restriction from several disseminating organizations, including The Social Science Data Center, University of Connecticut.

- 1975. Faculty survey conducted under the direction of Everett Ladd and Martin Lipset. 3,536 respondents from a national sample of colleges and universities. Available without restriction from The Social Science Data Center, University of Connecticut. (continuation next page)

to just 28 percent of those at the major research universities. But even at the latter institutions--those most emphasizing research and those best equipped in terms of facilities to promote it--large numbers of faculty do not publish extensively (Tables 2 and 4).

Haven't I been dwelling too much on numbers? Isn't it possible for Professor X to labor his whole career on one book, and thereby build a monument to scholarship, while Professor Y produces one hundred articles not worth the sacrifice of a single tree? Of course. The type of survey data with which I am working here captures numbers, not quality. I would still insist that the publication of articles, books, and monographs is the primary mode of scholarly exchange in most disciplines, and that it is meaningful to note that large numbers of faculty rarely if ever engage in this exchange. And while one can easily cite individual exceptions, it is probably true for the professoriate as a whole that major research contributions are

---

1 (cont'd.)

- o 1975. Carnegie Council survey of faculty. 25,262 respondents from a national sample of colleges and universities. Available with certain restrictions from The Survey Research Center, University of California at Berkeley.
- o 1977. Faculty survey conducted under the direction of Everett Ladd and Martin Lipset. 4,383 respondents from a national sample of colleges and universities. To become available without restriction in the Summer of 1979 from The Social Science Data Center, University of Connecticut.

rarely associated with those who publish only two or three items over the course of a career. One cannot equate publishing heavily with making a major research contribution, but one can probably equate publishing very little or not at all with an insubstantial research contribution--as a general rule.[2]

Teaching

American academics have often been criticized for not spending much time with their students, for fleeing the classroom for their research and writing. While there is surely some basis for this charge, we know that the majority of the faculty members are very actively engaged in teaching. The 1977 Survey showed 47 percent of professors spending ten or more hours per week "in formal instruction in class"; 30 percent taught thirteen or more hours a week; only 17 percent had four weekly hours or less of classroom contact. Substantial to heavy teaching loads (nine hours or up) are the rule everywhere outside the research universities (Table 6).

---

2 It might be noted here that outside the natural sciences, those who write a large number of articles and those who publish many books are, with few exceptions, the same people. The pattern is very different in the natural science disciplines where journal articles are the normal form of scholarship.

Professors report fairly standard work weeks, in terms of numbers of hours devoted to professional activities. While 18 percent indicate that they work 55 hours or more in an average week, 13 percent state that they put in less than 30 hours (with this proportion rising to 33 percent of those at two-year colleges). The mean work week which all faculty report is 44 hours and the median number of hours spent in professional activities in a typical week is 43 hours (Table 7). For most faculty, teaching is the big claimant of time. The median number of hours put into research and scholarly writing is four, compared to something in the 9 to 16 hour range for both scheduled teaching and preparing for teaching. Everywhere outside the research universities teaching-related activities dwarf those related to scholarship.[3]

Preferences

Academics as a group spend a fairly modest amount of their time in research and scholarship, much of it in teaching. And they prefer it this way. Only 7 percent indicate that their interests lie heavily in research.

---

3 The students who occupy these many hours of faculty time are, disproportionately, undergraduates. Only 13 percent of all professors indicate that graduate students in doctoral-level programs are their "primary teaching responsibility"; the proportion is 37 percent among faculty at research universities. Some 73 percent of academics indiate that undergraduates are the primary group with whom they work (Table 8).

Another 23 percent express an interest in both teaching and research, but with a "leaning" toward the latter. For the remaining 70 percent of academics, the personal preference is for teaching. For every one professor strongly devoted to research pursuits, there are five others heavily committed to teaching. These proportions have remained fairly constant over the last decade (Table 9).

The younger the faculty member, the more likely he or she is to have interests heavily or significantly in research. And the most research-committed group of all, by far, are young faculty at research universities. Even at the latter set of institutions, those which are by far the most research emphasizing, a majority of faculty 45 years of age and older state that they are more interested in teaching than in research (Table 10).

Respondents to the 1975 and the 1977 Ladd-Lipset surveys were asked to indicate which among a series of categories best identified their academic roles. The terms fitted into two larger groupings. "Scholar," "scientist," and "intellectual" all speak to a primary involvement in the research enterprise. "Professional" and "teacher," on the other hand, suggest a concentration in the classromm or in administration, in communicating

knowledge rather than developing new knowledge. Seventy percent of all academics--with a proportion ranging from 93 percent at two-year colleges to 50 percent at research universities--think of themselves as teachers or as professionals (Table 11).

There is, on the surface, a fairly good fit between what faculty want to do--with regard to teaching and research--and what they are required to do. For example, those who say their personal preferences are heavily for research have very light teaching loads--the median is four hours per week--while those who are principally interested in teaching get a chance to teach a lot, with a median at twelve hours a week. I do not overlook the possibility of some benign deception: Professors who must teach a lot saying, "Oh, well, I really prefer teaching anyway." And there is that fraction of 1 percent of the professoriate who are strongly committed to research but are required to teach 21 or more hours each week! On the whole, though, the fit is, superficially, a good one. Later in this paper, I will argue that, in a very different sense, the fit between interests and stipulated behavior is very bad.

Dissatisfactions

By all of the measures we have reviewed, American academics constitute a teaching profession. Yet it is a teaching profession very much dissatisfied with its handywork. We hear a lot these days, and for good reason, about the economic troubles which beset higher education in this age of little economic growth and high inflation. Faculty salaries are losing ground to inflation. Faculty salaries are losing ground to inflation and to the salary performance of other occupations.[4]

But faculty dissatisfactions are by no means strictly economic. There is the strong sense that the teaching enterprise is not going well, and for reasons quite removed from dollars and cents.

Table 12 shows something of the range of faculty criticism of the teaching activity in higher education. Thus, 72 percent argue that too many people ill-suited

---

4 The "Report on the Annual Survey of Faculty Compensation, 1977-78" published in the September, 1978 AAUP Bulletin (pp. 193-210) shows the average rate of compensation (including fringe benefits) declining yearly since the 1972-73 academic year, when one controls for inflation. The rates of decline for each academic year from the previous year are reported to be 1.5 percent in 1973-74, 4.2 percent in 1974-75, 0.7 percent in 1975-76, 0.3 percent in 1976-77, and 1.1 percent in the 1977-78 academic year. These data were collected by the National Center for Educational Statistics and prepared by Committee Z of the America Association of University Professors.

for academic life are now enrolling in colleges and universities. Ninety-six percent maintain that the students with whom they have close contact are seriously underprepared in basic skills, such as those required for written and oral communication. The argument that there has been a widespread lowering of standards in American higher education is accepted by 81 percent of all professors. That grade inflation is a serious academic standards problem "at my institution" is agreed to in whole or in part by all but 4 percent of academics. And faculty are not simply inclined to point the finger of criticism at their colleagues. Sixty-nine percent of them agree that "I find myself not grading as 'hard,' not applying as high standards in assessing student work, as I believe I should." We find a malaise, then, extending all across faculty assessments of the quality of the teaching activity. And the complaints are by no means confined to one sector of academe. They are offered as much by professors at research universities as those at two-year colleges, as much by young as by senior professors (Table 12).

II. THE TYRANNY OF THE RESEARCH MODEL

Most college and university professors in the United States do not think of themselves as research people. Their interests lie primarily in teaching. They spend most of their time in teaching-related activities. And a clear majority of faculty have published little or nothing. None of these conditions, by themselves, present any cause for concern. With more than ten million students enrolled in institutions of higher education, there is more than enough work to be done by the majority whose preferences and performance cast academe as a teaching profession.

Still, there is a problem--at least as I see it and, it appears, in the judgment of many observers of the performance of American higher education. This problem arises from the clear ascendancy within a teaching profession of a norm or model which emphasizes the importance of research. Where does this research model hold sway? First and foremost, the strength of its claim can be seen in the value structures of people associated with higher education. Whether or not they themselves do research or want to engage in original scholarship, most faculty seem to believe that the most

meritorious behavior of an academic man or woman is the performance of significant research.

I advance this conclusion about faculty believing in research as really the highest calling on the basis of hundreds of informal conversations with professors and administrators in institutions of higher learning across the country--and not on the basis of any systematic survey data. The Carnegie surveys and those which Martin Lipset and I directed really do not provide any firm information on this subject.

When a particular norm is ascendant within a group and is institutionalized in various ways, it is very hard for a member of the group to deny its claim even if intellectually he is fully convinced of its serious deficiency. I grew up in a town where performing ably for the high school football team was deemed the highest accomplishment to which a teenage male could aspire. I had no ability in football and no personal interest in participating in it; still, it was very hard indeed for me to deny the norm that athletic prowess was especially meritorious. Probably every reader of this paper has had some such experience. It is hardly necessary that a norm rest comfortably with the preferences and performance of most members of a group for it to compel their attention and to influence seriously their behavior.

My personal observations, supported in part by our survey data, are that most faculty don't like research and don't do it very well, if at all. It may well be that research, properly construed--meaning scholarly activity aimed at the creation of new ideas, new knowledge, new art forms, and the like--makes demands and requires skills such as to permanently restrict participation in it to a distinct minority of the faculty.

Many professors whom I encounter seem variously troubled by their failure to do significant research. They may encounter university pressures or peer criticisms. They may believe that in the absence of a "track record" of research accomplishments they are "trapped" at the institution where they now teach or are in grave peril of losing a "teaching" job all together. Some are troubled by the fact that, despite the continuing stream of rhetoric about the importance of good teaching, the concrete rewards for it are typically very weak. In many cases it seems that the faculty members themselves, however much they prefer teaching, find it hard to resist the notion that research really is a higher calling.

A model is ascendant in academe, positing what faculty <u>should be doing</u>, that is seriously out of touch with what they <u>actually do</u> and <u>want to do</u>. The model is as well profoundly at odds with the primary goal of promoting the best possible teaching--that is, the best educational

experience--in the nation's colleges and universities.

We have seen that large majorities of the faculty believe that the educational enterprise over which they preside is in various ways performing poorly. Students lack basic skills. Appropriate academic standards are being allowed to deteriorate. And so on. I cannot prove that there is any connection between such teaching-related dissatisfactions and the ascendancy of the research model. But I think there is a strong connection. So do large numbers of faculty and administrators with whom I have spoken--who believe that their college and universities are not educating students as well as they should or could, and that the emphasis which is variously placed on the importance of research is a culprit.

We have long heard it said, in defense of the research model, that "no one can be a good teacher unless he does research." This is, I think, nothing less than total nonsense. I intend, here, of course, to exempt from my claim the instruction of advanced doctoral students--where "teaching" often involves a kind of research apprenticeship with an active scholar. It is true that effective teaching requires careful preparation and that this preparation often involves something more than reading the textbook before the students read it. I would argue, looking to my own field, that no one can do an outstanding job of teaching advanced undergraduates in a course on public opinion unless he has himself worked

with survey data. It is necessary to "get one's hands dirty" in the data. It is very hard indeed to convey the properties of public opinion to students if one's only contact with such data comes from tables printed in a textbook. But this "hands-on" work with opinion data surely need not be research--the pursuit of new knowledge to be presented to one's peers. It can be a form of preparation for teaching where one actually conducts experiments using the data in order to better understand them and present them effectively to students.

Surely it is not true that no one can be a good college teacher unless he does research. It is also not true, but it is far nearer being valid, that no one can be a good teacher if he is actively involved in research. Teaching is a vocation. To be done well, it requires not only the expenditure of large amounts of time but the psychological commitment that it is vitally important and worthy of one's best efforts. It requires real ego involvement. And it is very hard to serve two masters--hard to be both committed to excellence of teaching and high achievement in research. Many faculty and administrators--and I am tempted to say a growing number, on the basis of conversations that I have had over the past two years--believe that the caliber of undergraduate teaching is suffering from the emphasis--psychological, if not in the number of hours put in--on demonstrating some research proficiency and

attainment. Can one think of a neater prescription for malperformance: Nurturing the claims among professors of a research model, even though large majorities of them prefer teaching and are required by the concrete demands of their job to concentrate on teaching, combining so as to produce a diminished commitment to quality teaching and the substantial production of inferior research.

It is not hard to see how it came to pass that the research model took hold as it did. Contemporary American society does require and can support extensive and diverse research activity. Given the way we have organized things, teaching and research are conducted side by side in the same institution. Research has many attractions. It offers, for example, the opportunity to get one's name in print and acquire national recognition. It can be codified and reduced and entered on vitae in such a fashion that it can be assessed by one's peers at other institutions fairly and easily. Research activity, then, lends itself to a situation in which the profession replaces the institution (college or university) as the primary evaluator of academic performance--precisely the situation, of course, that has developed in the United States in the years since World War II. There are still other

factors, and one seems very important. Probably most graduate students are thoroughly indoctrinated in the research model and they carry its values with them as they move out to positions in colleges and universities of all types around the country.

There really is need, of course, for good research--and a lot of it--in the nation's colleges and universities. My point is not that too much research is being done, but rather that is foolish, even pernicious, to insist that the same people perform at high levels in both research and teaching.

The reward structures for good research seem reasonably sturdy. We need to rebuild those for good teaching. We need to provide much more in the way of financial support for teaching preparation--even those elaborate forms of teaching preparation that some would call research. We need to find far better ways--hard though it is--to encourage faculty to get their ego engagement in quality teaching while at the same time encouraging some of their colleagues at the same institutions to emphasize research. This sort of "pluralism" will not be attained unless large numbers of faculty and administrators become convinced of its importance and then elaborate the many specific mechanisms which it requires.

The "teaching vs research" argument is hardly a new one. It has occupied the attention of faculty and

administrators in the past and has inspired numerous experiments to redress perceived imbalances. My argument is nothing more than that these efforts have largely failed and that today the teaching profession is tyrannized by a research model. The intellectual health of both academics and academe will be improved if there are renewed and ultimately successful efforts to give recognition to the training of students in what is primarily a teaching profession.

TABLE 1

PUBLICATION HISTORY OF AMERICAN ACADEMICS

(Grand Total Percentages)

	ARTICLES PUBLISHED							
BOOKS PUBLISHED	None	1-2	3-4	5-10	11-20	21-30	31-50	More than 50
None	24.4%	11.3%	6.9%	7.8%	4.2%	1.7%	1.4%	1.0%
1-2	4.0	6.4	3.9	5.6	3.4	1.4	0.8	1.0
3-4	0.5	1.6	0.7	2.0	1.2	0.8	0.5	1.0
5-10	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.7	1.3	0.3	0.4	0.6
More than 10	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.9

1977 Survey of the American Professiorate directed by Everett C. Ladd, Jr. and Seymour M. Lipset.

TABLE 1A

PUBLICATION HISTORY OF AMERICAN ACADEMICS

(Grand Total Percentages)*

BOOKS PUBLISHED	ARTICLES PUBLISHED: None	1-2	3-4	5-10	11-20	21-30	31-50	More than 50
None	24.4% (a)	11.3% (b)	6.9%	7.8%	4.2%	1.7%	1.4%	1.0%
1-2	4.0 (c)	6.4	3.9	5.6 (d)	3.4	1.4	0.8	1.0
3-4	0.5	1.6	0.7	2.0	1.2	0.8 (f)	0.5	1.0
5-10	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.7	1.3	0.3	0.4	0.6
More than 10	0.4 (e)	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1 (g)	0.2	0.9

Cells a - g represent the following:

a = None
b = Almost none
c = Light
d = Moderate
e = Heavy (Books only)
f = Heavy (Articles only)
g = Heavy (Both Books and Articles)

* Each figure above represents the percentage of the total sample who meet both the criteria for the "Books published" category and the "Articles published" category. For example, the first figure (24.4%) is the percentage of all respondents to these two questions who have not published any books or articles. Grand total of cell population = 100%.

Source: The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset

TABLE 2

CAREER PUBLICATION BY TYPE OF SCHOOL**

(Column Percentages)

Amount of publications:	ALL SCHOOLS	Research Universities	Doctoral Granting Universities	Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	Liberal Arts Colleges	Two-year Colleges
None	24%	7%	13%	25%	39%	51%
Almost none	18	12	18	24	23	16
Light	14	9	14	16	10	20
Moderate	21	32	28	18	24	5
Heavy (Books only)	10	10	12	11	3	8
Heavy (Articles only)	10	24	11	4	2	*
Heavy (Both Books and Articles)	3	6	4	2	0	0

* Less than 1%

** Schools have been classified according to the gradient developed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (1973).

Source: The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

TABLE 3

CAREER PUBLICATION BY AGE

(Column Percentages)

	ALL FACULTY	Under 35 years of age	35-44 years	45-54 years	55 and older
Amount of publications:					
None	24%	28%	26%	25%	17%
Almost none	18	24	16	19	10
Light	14	20	13	11	18
Moderate	21	21	27	19	14
Heavy (Books only)	10	5	7	12	18
Heavy (Articles only)	10	2	11	11	17
Heavy (Both Books and Articles)	3	0	1	4	7

The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

TABLE 4

PUBLICATIONS LAST TWO YEARS BY TYPE OF SCHOOL
(Column Percentages)

Amount of publications: *	ALL SCHOOLS	Research Universities	Doctoral Granting Universities	Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	Liberal Arts Colleges	Two-year Colleges
None	43%	18%	32%	46%	57%	85%
Light	26	29	30	28	31	11
Moderate	18	25	24	16	10	4
Heavy	13	27	14	10	3	0

* The figures above represent, for each type of school and for all faculty, the percentages of respondents who have had, during the two-year period prior to this survey, the following amount of books and articles published or accepted for publication: "None" (no books or articles); "light" (no books and 1, 2, or 3 articles); "moderate" (no books and 4 or 5 articles, or 1 book and not more than 5 articles); "heavy" (2 or more books or at least 6 articles).

Source: The 1977 Survey of the American Professiorate directed by E. C. Ladd and S. M. Lipset.

TABLE 5

PUBLICATIONS LAST TWO YEARS BY AGE

(Column Percentages)

	ALL FACULTY	Under 35 years of age	35-44 years	45-54 years	55 and older
Amount of publication:					
None	43%	38%	36%	50%	55%
Light	26	31	29	22	20
Moderate	18	18	20	19	11
Heavy	13	14	15	10	15

1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

TABLE 6

HOURS SPENT IN AN AVERAGE WEEK ON PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

(Row Percentages)

Hours spent in an average week on. . .	ALL SCHOOLS	Research Universities	Doctoral Granting Universities	Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	Liberal Arts Colleges	Two-year Colleges
Scheduled teaching						
None	3%	4%	2%	2%	1%	3%
1-4	11	23	14	5	2	4
5-8	21	39	28	15	15	6
9-16	55	29	51	65	74	68
17-34	10	4	5	11	8	18
35+	1	1	*	2	0	0
Preparing for teaching						
None	3	4	2	3	0	5
1-4	12	18	11	12	8	7
5-8	28	29	27	24	19	36
9-16	37	34	36	39	30	39
17-34	18	14	22	18	41	10
35+	3	2	2	4	3	2
Research and scholarly writing						
None	21	6	10	23	27	47
1-4	28	15	23	34	51	31
5-8	19	19	21	22	12	11
9-16	17	25	24	13	6	8
17-34	12	26	17	6	4	2
35+	4	9	4	2	*	1

* Less than 1%

The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by Everett C. Ladd, Jr. and Seymour M. Lipset

TABLE 7

HOURS SPENT IN AN AVERAGE WEEK ON PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
(Row Percentages)

	Hours per week								
	Under 30	30-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60+	Mean Hrs./Wk.	Median Hrs./Wk.
ALL FACULTY	13%	23%	17%	13%	16%	6%	12%	44 hrs.	43 hrs.
FACULTY AT:									
Two-year Colleges	33	29	12	12	8	1	6	37	34
Liberal Arts Colleges	19	23	10	21	8	9	10	42	43
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	8	24	21	11	17	6	13	45	44
Doctoral Granting Universities	8	22	21	12	18	6	13	46	44
Research Universities	7	20	17	15	21	7	14	46	46

The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by Everett C. Ladd, Jr. and Seymour M. Lipset

TABLE 8

ACADEMIC LEVELS OF THE STUDENTS WHO ARE TAUGHT

(Row Percentages)

	Graduate students in a doctoral-level program	Graduate students in a masters degree level program	Undergraduates majoring in your discipline	Undergraduates enrolled in introductory courses in your discipline
ALL FACULTY	13%	9%	38%	35%
FACULTY AT:				
Two-year Colleges	0	0	23	77
Liberal Arts Colleges	0	*	61	39
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	7	9	50	35
Doctoral Granting Universities	17	17	44	22
Research Universities	37	14	32	17

* Less than 1%

Question: "Please indicate which group of students among the following you consider to be your *primary* teaching responsibility."

The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by Everett C. Ladd, Jr. and Seymour M. Lipset

TABLE 9

THE RELATIVE CLAIMS OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH

(Row Percentages)

	Very heavily in research	In both, but leaning toward research	In both, but leaning toward teaching	Very heavily in teaching
"Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or in research?"				
1977 Ladd/Lipset Faculty Survey	7%	23%	35%	36%
1975 Ladd/Lipset Faculty Survey	4	21	38	37
1975 Carnegie Council Survey	4	21	36	39
1969 Carnegie Commission Survey	4	20	34	43

	Strongly Agree	Agree with reservations	Disagree with reservations	Strongly Disagree
"Teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty."				
1975 Ladd/Lipset Faculty Survey	36	38	20	6
1975 Carnegie Council Survey	40	36	18	6
1969 Carnegie Commission Survey	37	40	19	4
"Excessive commitment to research has so drawn energy and attention from teaching that the quality of undergraduate education has suffered significantly."				
1975 Ladd/Lipset Faculty Survey	27	44	23	6

TABLE 10

TEACHING AND RESEARCH COMMITMENTS

(Row Percentages)

	Very heavily in research	In both but leaning toward research	In both but leaning toward teaching	Very heavily in teaching
ALL FACULTY				
FACULTY AT:				
Two-year Colleges	0	8	23	69
Liberal Arts Colleges	3	8	48	42
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	4	18	41	38
Doctoral Granting Universities	9	31	38	23
Research Universities	15	42	29	15
Under 35 years of age	20	46	24	9
35-44	16	44	30	10
45-54	11	40	31	18
55+	9	34	33	24

The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by Everett C. Ladd, Jr. and Seymour M. Lipset

TABLE 11

PROFESSIONAL SELF-PERCEPTIONS

(Row Percentages)

	Teacher	Professional	Scientist	Scholar	Intellectual
ALL FACULTY	43%	27%	14%	11%	4%
FACULTY AT:					
Two-year Colleges	56	37	2	3	2
Liberal Arts Colleges	64	11	11	6	8
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	54	25	9	10	3
Doctoral Granting Universities	32	26	19	16	7
Research Universities	21	29	28	18	4

Question: "Some faculty members are inclined to think of themselves as 'intellectuals.' Others find 'scholar,' 'scientist,' 'teacher,' or 'professional' more satisfactory descriptors. Which of these terms describes you best?"

The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by E. C. Ladd, Jr. and S. M. Lipset.

TABLE 12

CRITICISMS DIRECTED AT HIGHER EDUCATION

Percentage agreeing strongly or with reservations

	High Student Enrollment ill-suited for Academia[1]	Academic Standards have lowered[2]	Students Unprepared in Basic Skills[3]	Institutional Problem: Grade Inflation[4]	Personally not Grading as hard[5]
ALL FACULTY	72%	81%	96%	94%	69%
FACULTY AT:					
Two-year Colleges	70	84	100	94	62
Liberal Arts Colleges	79	85	96	91	65
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	74	83	98	98	74
Doctoral Granting Universities	76	79	95	94	69
Research Universities	68	77	89	90	65
Under 35 years of age	70	81	89	93	67
35-44	67	76	90	89	60
45-54	64	78	89	90	65
55+	73	72	90	89	68

The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate directed by Everett C. Ladd, Jr. and Seymour M. Lipset.

QUESTION TEXT:

1. "Too many people ill-suited to academic life are now enrolling in colleges and universities...(Strongly agree, agree with reservations, disagree with reservations, or strongly disagree)."

2. "There has been a widespread lowering of standards in American higher education. . . (Strongly agree, agree with reservations, disagree with reservations, or strongly disagree)."

3. "The students with whom I have close contact are seriously underprepared in basic skills--such as those required for written and oral communication. (Definitely yes, Only partly, or Definitely no)."

4. "'Grade inflation' is a serious academic standards problem at my institution. (Definitely yes, Only partly, or Definitely no)."

5. "I find myself not grading as "hard," not applying as high standards in assessing student work, as I believe I should. (Definitely yes, Only partly, or Definitely no)."